SIFW

APR 13 2007 W

Application No.: 10/785,323 Attorney Docket No.: 09812.0408-00000

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)
Kouichi MATSUDA)) Group Art Unit: 2629
Application No.: 10/785,323)) Examiner: Vijay Shankar `
Filed: February 24, 2004) Confirmation No.: 9695
For: DISPLAY DEVICE	<i>)</i>)
Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	
Sir:	

RESPONSE TO SPECIES ELECTION REQUIREMENT

In a species election requirement mailed March 29, 2007, the Examiner required Applicant to elect one of the following alleged species:

Species 1, as shown in Figure 1; and

Species 2, as shown in Figure 14.

Applicant provisionally elects to prosecute Species 1, Figure 1, with traverse.

Claims 1-8 read on Figure 1.

Applicant traverses the election of species requirement. The Office Action provides no analysis of Figures 1 and 14 and no analysis of the allegedly distinct species. Indeed, Figures 1 and 14 do not disclose mutually exclusive species.

Application No.: 10/785,323 Attorney Docket No.: 09812.0408-00000

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: April 13, 2007

Michael R. Kelly

Reg. No. 33,921